

QUESTION: Can you comment on Senator Goldwater's statement Tuesday asking if the Jupiter missiles in Europe are being withdrawn and B-47s deactivated in Spain, Britain, Morocco, Alaska and Guam because there is some kind of a deal involving Cuba and disarmament plans?

FACTS: The Jupiter missile which is being removed from European bases is an older missile and is being superseded by the Polaris, which is a more modern, less vulnerable and more mobile weapons system. As to deactivation of B-47s, the Defense Department has announced that the scheduled reduction of the B-47 force began in 1959 with the introduction of intercontinental missiles and higher performance bomber aircraft into the weapons inventory. The phase-out of the B-47 medium bombers will continue gradually over the next several years. Secretary McNamara reported this before Congressional committees last year and again before the Armed Services Committee in this session of Congress. The phase out of B-47s does not in any way affect U.S. plans for continued use of the B-52s or the B-58 supersonic bombers. The replacement of the B-47s in our defense posture with the more modern weapons systems will further increase the strength of our nuclear deterrent force.

QUESTION: Can you tell us when the JUPITERs in Italy and Turkey will be withdrawn?

FACTS: This is one of the matters being discussed with the North Atlantic Council and until these discussions are completed we do not have a target date for the deactivation.

QUESTION: There have been repeated reports in the press, usually quoting members of Congress, who, in turn, usually attribute their facts to refugee sources, indicating that the Soviet Union is using Cuba as a base for submarine operations or is building submarine bases there. Can you comment on this?

FACTS: In his televised press conference on February 6, Mr. McNamara stated that we not only lack evidence of submarine bases in Cuba; we have positive evidence that there are none. Admiral Anderson, the Chief of Naval Operations said in San Diego on February 8 that he believed that the Soviets planned to use Cuba as a submarine base but that our firm action last fall deterred them from so doing. He said that there is no evidence of Soviet submarine operations or construction of Soviet submarine bases in Cuba. About seven Cuban ports have been mentioned in various press stories as Soviet submarine bases. The fact is that the approaches to most of these harbors are so shallow as to make them most unattractive for submarine operations. The strategic significance of the submarine is its ability for concealment. It would not make much sense for the Russians to build submarine bases in ports which their subs would have to approach on the surface or at such shallow depths, for many miles, that we would be able to detect them without difficulty. Also, all Cuban ports are covered frequently by aerial reconnaissance, which not only tells us that there are no submarine facilities under construction in Cuba but also acts as a powerful

deterrent to the use of these ports by Soviet submarines. The Soviets are helping the Cubans to improve several ports, for fishing and other commercial purposes. It is easy for an untrained observer to conclude that these improvements are for submarines. The facts, as we see them, are otherwise.

QUESTION: In face of repeated rumors that the Russians are hiding missiles in caves, can you give any assurance that this is not being done?

FACTS: There is no evidence that offensive missiles are being stored in caves. The MRBM which was in Cuba is approximately 60 feet long without nose cone. The missiles transporter, with its towing bar and tractor, make up a vehicle approximately 90 feet in length. Such a vehicle would require either reasonable good roads or level terrain in order to maneuver. No roads capable of supporting such a vehicle have been found leading to caves in Cuba, and the terrain surrounding those caves is generally unfavorable for operating such vehicles without roads.

QUESTION: Since Secretary McNamara's press briefing on February 6 there has appeared to be a clamp down on news about Cuba. Did you order such a clamp down? Senator Jackson suggested on February 2 that the Defense Department issue a weekly report on Cuba. Do you agree with this suggestion and, if not, do you feel such a report should not be issued?

FACTS: Secretary McNamara in his February 6 briefing indicated that he was going to extraordinary lengths, even to possible degradation of our intelligence capabilities, in order to assure the public on an extremely important issue. Since that time we have followed our normal practice of not revealing classified intelligence information. Briefings such as Senator Jackson suggested could be carried out only if we were to again reveal intelligence information.

QUESTION: Have any Soviet troops defected in Cuba, and have any tried to enter Guantanamo?

FACIS: Not to our knowledge.

QUESTION: Is there any difference of opinion within the Administration as to whether or not Cuba represents a threat as a base for subversion in Latin America?



QUESTION: Walter Lippmann column on Tuesday said that there was no aerial surveillance over Cuba between September 5 and October 14. Is there an explanation for this?

FACTS: Reconnaissance flights were flown on September 5, September 17, September 26, September 29, October 5, October 7 and October 14.

QUESTION: In the face of the Navy's difficulty in locating SULPHUR QUEEN or the ANZOATEGUI, how can you be confident that we are adequately watching the sea lanes leading into Cuba?

FACTS: The search for these vessels is an entirely different problem from that of maintaining surveillance over the sea approaches to Cuba. Aerial surveillance has shown that SULPHUR QUEEN did not go to Cuba. When we were advised by the Venezuelan Government that ANZOATEGUI was believed to be headed for Cuba, we conducted an area search and stationed ships in certain passages, thus insuring that the ship could not approach Cuba without being seen. The initial search for ANZOATEGUI did not include the area to the southeast into which the ship actually went. It is a much simpler operation to watch the sea approaches to Cuba than it is to find a ship whose position, course and speed are unknown.

During the first 24 hours of the search for the ANZOATEGUI, the Navy had searched, by radar and eyeball, the Caribbean Sea area bounded by the Greater Antilles, the northern coast of South America and the Lesser Antilles, encountering more than 400 merchant ships of 1,000 tons or larger and hundreds of smaller craft. This search effort had covered more than 750,000 square miles of ocean. The area of search was subsequently widened, and shortly thereafter the ship was found.

QUESTION: On what basis did Admiral Dennison send out a message for the ship ANZOATEGUI to go to Puerto Rico? Was this done at the request of the Venezuelans?

FACTS: Admiral Dennison sent a message to the ship ANZOATEGUI to change course to Puerto Rico, which was the closest U. S. port. This message was sent in response to a message from the ANZOATEGUI, asking if their crew would be granted U. S. asylum, as had been offered by Cuba. The message was not sent as a direct request by Venezuela but in the context of the original request of the Venezuelans to find the ship and stop it. The Pentagon has said and continues to say that Admiral Dennison sent his message to the ship in response to their message asking if they would be granted asylum in the United States.